

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 103

SP 004 657

AUTHOR Hughes, Larry W.
TITLE A Program To Prepare Administrator/Change Agents for Southern Appalachia.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at annual meeting, AERA, 1971
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents, Chief Administrators, *Educational Administration, *Masters Degrees, Rural Schools

ABSTRACT

A program was conducted to train 20 experienced teachers and administrators from school districts in Southern Appalachia as agents of change in entry-level administrative leadership positions in the districts from which they have been recruited. Leading to a master of science degree with a major in educational administration and supervision, the program covered 15 months full-time spanning a summer, a full academic year, and the following summer. Included were a human relations laboratory (sensitivity training), selected field problems, simulation, an intensive humanities "live in" seminar, an academic year-long behavioral science seminar, and seminars in change agency, decision making, and group processes. Other experiences included two short-term internships in the home district during the 15-month period, an organized program for the development of strategies for implementing needed changes in the home district. Results of a test battery administered before the program indicated a group well above average in academic potential and ability with a slightly better than average achievement record, a reasonable competence in general English skills, a strong conceptual ability, with a tendency toward dogmatism in its attitudes. Reaction to the program by both staff and fellows was "overwhelmingly favorable," with the "live in" humanities seminar and human relations laboratory ranked as major strengths. (JS)

A PROGRAM TO PREPARE
ADMINISTRATOR/CHANGE AGENTS FOR SOUTHERN APPALACHIA

(A paper presented by Larry W. Hughes* at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting in New York City on February 7th, 1971 at the Symposium, "Training Administrators for Disadvantaged Pupils: An Evaluation.")

In June, 1968, the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at The University of Tennessee initiated a new kind of Master's degree program with a grant under the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program (Title IV-C of the Higher Education Act). This program, designed to prepare teachers for entry-level administrative positions in local school districts, had as its focus change agency. There were four assumptions upon which the program was developed:

1. It is possible to educate a person to perform the role of a change agent in the school.
2. The person who can, within the educational bureaucracy, most effectively bring about the local school change is the ascribed leader of the school--the principal.
3. Individuals who have already achieved some degree of acceptance in the school organization and/or community are more likely to be able to speed the process of change than those who have not.
4. The realities of recruitment of administrators to function in schools in southern Appalachia are such that primarily local teachers currently working in those schools provide the best (and perhaps, only) leadership source.

*Dr. Hughes, Professor and Interim Head of the Department of Educational Administration & Supervision at The University of Tennessee is director of the projects reported in this presentation.

Essentially then, the general program objective was directed toward preparing principals to function as change agents in elementary and secondary schools in southern Appalachia. Twenty Fellows were selected for the 15-month residency which began early in June, 1968. One of the most critical selection criteria was that the district from which the candidate came was required to agree to place the Fellow in an administrative position immediately upon completion of the Program. Successful completion of the Program resulted in the Master of Science degree plus additional post-Master's credit. (Subsequent to the first two years of the program, selected applicants were accepted at the Ed.S. and Ed.D. levels.

THE PROGRAM

It was the purpose of the proposed program to train experienced teachers and administrators from school districts in southern Appalachia as agents of change in entry-level administrative leadership positions in the districts from which they have been recruited.

Southern Appalachia is recognized as an area with serious education deficiencies. Schools in this region share many common problems. They contain a preponderance of rural or small city school districts. Further, these states are engaged in school desegregation and face the problem of consolidation as some schools are closed by desegregation plans. Improvement of the quality of education in the region is a critical need, for the effects of poor education are felt not only within the region but extend to the ghettos of the major urban

centers to which large numbers of Appalachian disadvantaged, both black and white, migrate.

There is a great need for well-qualified school administrators who understand problems related to change and have the skill to effect needed improvements. This training need has been documented by the National Advisory Committee on Educational Personnel Development and a priority has been placed upon the training of persons for positions of leadership in school systems. Educational leaders equipped with appropriate knowledge, understanding, and skills are needed to direct and help achieve the educational improvements needed in Southern Appalachia.

Endemic to southern Appalachia, as well as to many other areas of the nation, is a history of selecting school administrators and educational leaders through a political process which has not always recognized professional expertise. This situation fosters minimal entrance requirements for school administrators. There is subsequently created a pool of beginning administrators and leaders with little professional competence and skill. It is from this group that middle and top level educational leaders for school districts are drawn. The promotion of administrators, who themselves are ill-prepared, does not encourage higher standards for administrators, further graduate study and continuing inservice education programs. Further, in southern Appalachia there is no pool of well-trained experienced administrators available to school systems aspiring to improve the quality of education available to children in the region.

To help meet this need, the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at The University of Tennessee provided a unified plan for developing and training educational leaders for administrative positions in school systems. It was the intention of this program to provide experienced young teachers, as well as young practising middle-level administrators, selected by local school districts and The University of Tennessee, with the training necessary to qualify them as educational change agents in their sponsoring school districts.

Participants were selected from among applicants by a selection committee composed of the Director, Assistant Directors, Department Head, and one other member of the Department on the basis of the following criteria:

- (1) Preference was given to candidates from the States of Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.
- (2) The applicant must have had at least one academic year of professional experience prior to application.
- (3) The applicant had to be eligible for admission to the Graduate School of The University of Tennessee. This means graduation from an accredited college or university with a 2.5 academic average on a four-point scale.
- (4) The applicant must have scored sufficiently high on various standardized and subjective tests* required to be submitted along with the application forms.

* In addition to the general university requirements described in (3) above, specific selection devices and procedures which are employed include:

- (a) Rokeach Attitude Inventory (acceptable range 120-200 with balance evident in responses.)
- (b) Miller Analogies Test (raw score of 50 or above is desired.)
- (c) Ohio State Psychological Examination (75th percentile or above is desired).
- (d) Two essay questions focusing upon administrative role and change.

- (5) The applicant had to be recommended by the superintendent and/or board of education of his home school district, and a letter of intent submitted which indicated that the district would promote the candidate to an administrative position upon satisfactory completion of the program.
- (6) The candidate had to complete a letter of intent to return to his school district the year following the completion of the program.
- (7) The professional background of the applicant was considered since the program is designed to encourage classroom teachers to develop their administrative and leadership abilities.

Although the selection devices and procedures were generally followed, no single device or procedure, with the possible exception of the sending district's letter of intent to promote the candidate to an administrative position upon satisfactory completion of the program, was considered critical. The selection committee felt that each device had its limitations in predictability and selections were made with cognizance of this. The pattern was more important to the committee than any single component making up the pattern.

Assuming the availability of qualified applicants, an attempt was made by the selection committee to choose at least one Fellow from each of the seven Southern Appalachia states.

The Program departed considerably from most Master's degree programs in educational administration. One major difference was that it was a full-time program at the Master's degree level, whereas the Master's degree in educational administration generally tends to be taken on a part-time basis. Additionally, several innovative procedures and processes were employed. As will be noted in Figure 1.

The program includes a human relations laboratory (sensitivity training), selected field problems, simulation, an intensive humanities "live in" seminar, an academic year-long behavioral science seminar, and seminars in change agency, decision-making, and group processes. Other experiences included two short-term internships in the home district during the 15-month period, an organized program for the development of strategies for implementing needed changes in the home district.

A feature of the Winter Quarter was a nine-hour core block which was team-taught by three professors--one from the area of Curriculum and Instruction and two from the area of Educational Administration. The focus of this core was directing and supervising organizational and curriculum change.

Activities were planned to proceed from exposure to maximum involvement. Course work proceeded from developing adequate insights into contemporary social problems to integrating knowledge and skills in effective problem-solving. The major goal was to provide for conceptual, human and technical skill development and the prime function was to synthesize and to minimize learning opportunities in a series of interrelated activities and to minimize the program featuring discrete and isolated courses. Critical analysis of research and of educational problems was emphasized along with the integration of research into sound programs and the implementation of newly developed programs.

Program Organization, Content and Schedule

The program for EPDA Fellows at The University of Tennessee leading to a Master of Science degree with a major in educational administration and supervision covered 15 months full-time, spanning a summer, a full academic year, and the following summer.

The Fellows were treated as a group, comprising the total enrollment in some course areas, seminars, and planned experiences. They were kept together for a group orientation session, a human relations laboratory, a foundations course in educational administration, a humanities "live-in" seminar, a continuing seminar in the behavioral sciences, and for selected classes within each of the three major thrusts of the program, i.e., foundations, application, and integration.

To meet individual needs, the Fellows were counseled and encouraged to participate in courses and activities appropriate to their major area of interest. Fellows were assigned to a team of professors for guidance, supervision, and program development. Each Fellow participated in at least one school study working closely with a faculty-student team, attended one national conference (such as ASCD, NASSP, or DESP), prepared three cogent problem-oriented position papers, visited innovative school facilities, studied evolving educational programs, and participated in special seminars and activities.

Each of the Fellows participated in courses dealing with the change process and its application in education. Program emphasis was upon development of planning skills, problem definition skills, understanding research, making the transition from research to program,

implementation and evaluation of new programs, and the dissemination of results.

At this point I could go on and specifically detail the program components. But rather than do that, let me instead call your attention to some materials which I have brought with me for distribution and which you are welcome to take. Some of these materials are simple graphic illustrations of the total program. Others describe some of the program components in detail.

THE FELLOWS

A description of the Fellows who have participated in the program may be useful. Even a cursory review of the backgrounds of the persons selected for the first year of the program reveal several characteristics which had implication to the nature of some programmatic experiences provided by the project.

By design, the Fellows were largely from southern Appalachia region. Exactly half of the first group of 20 were from Tennessee, four from North Carolina, and one representative from each of the following states: Kentucky, Alabama, Ohio, West Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia. Most had had their undergraduate education in small church related colleges, many located in remote areas. The second group of Fellows who began in June, 1969, 25 in number, were from: Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia and one from the DOD Dependent Schools in the Philippines.

The third group (20), who began in June 1970 were from: Alabama, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia.

The following are data about the first group of Fellows. It is generally descriptive of all three groups.

The Fellows ranged from 24 years of age to 51 years, with a mean age of 30.8. The lack of teaching experience correlated rather closely with the age factor. A range of professional experience from two years to eighteen years was evidence with a mean of 6.3 years.

A wide field of undergraduate majors existed with four Fellows majoring in social studies, three in business administration, two in history, two in mathematics, two in physical education, two in English, and one in each of the following: elementary education, home economics, biology, German, and economics.

The professional aspirations of any group of trainees are always interesting. Ten Fellows were headed for principalships, four for the superintendency, two for a position in higher education, two for central office jobs, and one specifically selected the state department of education as a goal. These expectations were made in early July following a year's study and were answers to the question, "what are your career expectations five or ten years from now?"

Test Data

Test data in the form of raw scores for the cooperative English test, the Ohio State Psychological Examination, Rokeach Dogmatism Scale,

the Miller Analogy tests, the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Test, and the Graduate Record Examination were collected.

The scores on the cooperative English test ranged from 178 to 150. A comparison of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program mean sub-scores with norms given for college sophomores indicating a margin of 3 to 6 points in favor of the Tennessee group.

The Ohio State Psychological Examination which is widely used to predict academic success at the graduate school level was administered as indicated and the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program group ranged in scores from 140 (99 percentile) to 91 (65 percentile) with a mean score of 117.55, which is approximately the 85th percentile. This compared with the main score for college freshmen at Ohio State University of 75. The Tennessee score seemed substantial but not out of line with other scores on a test battery such as the Miller Analogy test from the Graduate Record Examination. The mean score for the Experienced Teacher Fellowship group on the Rokeach Dogmatism scale was 181.2. Rokeach standardized his dogmatic (close-mind) norms and his open (open-mind) norms with a sample of only 20 in each case. His standard means for the dogmatic group was 157.2 with a standard deviation of 27.9 and a standard error of 6.2. His standard mean for the open group was 101.0 with a standard deviation of 33.18 and a standard error of 7.6. The Tennessee mean score was nearly one standard deviation above the dogmatic sample and over two standard deviation above the open sample. The only conclusion that could be drawn from these scores is that the Experienced Teacher Fellowship group

when tested on the Rokeach Dogmatism scale in the spring of 1968 had a strong tendency toward the dogmatic end of the scale.

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship scores on the Miller Analogy test ranged from 75 to 27. The mean score for the group was 53 which is about the 80th percentile compared to the mean score of 40 for educational administration graduate students and doctoral institutions.

Scores on the Watson-Glaser test of Critical Thinking ranged from 93 to 60 with a mean of 79.1. These compared favorably with normative scores.

Scores on the GRE ranged from 680 to 270 on the verbal section of the aptitude test, from 670 to 330 on the quantitative section, and from 650 to 420 on the advanced test in education. The mean scores for the three sub-tests were verbal equals 49, quantitative equals 510, and education equals 536. Norms for these tests are difficult to relate because so much depends upon the years they were taken. It is reasonable to say, however, that the Tennessee score compared favorably with Master's candidates in education at most institutions.

Undergraduate point averages (grade point averages) for the Experienced Teacher Fellowship group ranged from 3.52 to 2.10. The mean score for the GPA was 2.74.

In summary, results of the test battery administered before the program and it's inception indicated a group well above average in academic potential and ability with a slightly better than average achievement record, a reasonable competence in general English skills,

a strong conceptual ability, with a tendency toward dogmatism in its attitudes.

Much of these data just presented were developed by an independent evaluation team composed of off-campus personnel.

FOLLOW-UP

In the year following the 15 months residency professors from the university visit Fellows on the job. This phase of the program is considered an important element of the program as it provides (1) follow-up program evaluation, (2) continued contacts with local school systems to work on real problems, (3) identification of problems, ideas, etc. that need to be considered or incorporated into the ongoing training program, and (4) support for the Fellows as they attempt to re-establish themselves in their school districts and attempt to bring about needed changes.

Eighteen of the 20 1968-69 Fellows are performing in bona fide administrative roles, most as high school principals: 23 of the 25 1969-70 Fellows are currently administrators. All of the Fellows but 3 are functioning in Southern Appalachia. The three who are not were from districts outside the Appalachian region and returned to those districts after completing the program.

Major Strengths of the Program

Identification of the major strengths of the program by the staff and Fellows reveal that two program components - the "live-in" humanities seminar and the human relations laboratory continue to rank

the highest over other program elements. Some of the intrinsic values of these programs, are the promotion of cohesiveness and a high degree of closeness, group morale, and solidarity within the group.

Other identified strengths of the program are listed as follows:

- 1) The quality of communications and rapport between staff members and the Fellows.
- 2) Professional competencies and personality of the staff.
- 3) The use of new and innovative materials and interdisciplinary approaches to instruction, (e.g. video tapes, television, telelectures, curriculum center materials, films, programmed instruction, transparency sets, and language laboratories.)
- 4) The cooperation and cooperative endeavors that continue to develop between the University staff members and involved local school districts.
- 5) Follow-up activities and support given Fellows upon their return to their local school districts.
- 6) An increased awareness by the local districts' officials of the efficacy of the University staff members to assist them in improving the overall quality of general and specific educational programs.

Major Weaknesses and Problems of the Program

Both faculty and Fellows alike feel that lines of communication with the Fellows' home school districts remains somewhat inadequate in spite of very obvious improvements over the program conducted for the first two years. Local school districts have begun and continue to initiate contacts with the department about concerns other than the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program. Therefore, person-to-person contact is occurring more frequently and the University members are asked to assist local school districts in problem solutions and new program innovations and implementation at all levels.

While the reaction to the program by both staff and Fellows was "overwhelmingly favorable", several suggestions for improvement were

offered by some of the Fellows. These included the following:

- 1) More emphasis should be placed on rural Appalachian schools.
- 2) There is a need for better articulation between courses and specifications for problems papers.
- 3) There is a need for additional practical experiences to accompany theoretical considerations.
- 4) A rearranging of the sequence of certain program components might help (i.e., school law and finance if offered earlier would be of assistance in the development of the problems' papers).
- 5) More contacts, communications and relationships with the 1968-69 Fellows, the 1969-70 Fellows and the 1970-71 Fellows would be helpful.

May I again refer you to some of the materials which we have collected here and which you are free to take with you.

FIGURE 1

PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND SEQUENCE

<u>First Summer</u>	<u>Academic Year</u>	<u>Second Summer</u>	<u>Follow-up Year</u>
1. Human Relations Laboratory (2 weeks)	FALL:	1. Research Techniques (11 weeks)	1. School Finance & School Law Core (5½ weeks)
2. Course in Administrative Foundations (3 weeks)		2. School Planning Lab Seminar (4 weeks)	2. Decision-Making/ Educ. Psychology (11 weeks)
3. Humanities Seminar (4 weeks)		3. Educ. Psychology Seminar I (11 weeks)	3. Conflict Mngt Workshop (2 weeks)
4. Back-Home Internship (3 weeks)		4. Behavioral Science Seminar I (11 weeks)	3. ELECTIVES (2 weeks)
		5. Problems Paper I (11 weeks)	
		6. Fundamentals of Data Processing (11 weeks)	
	WINTER:		
	1. Core Program in Organizing and Supervising Curricular Change (11 weeks)	1. School Finance & School Law Core (5½ weeks)	1. Visits from University staff during first year back as an administrator (36 weeks)
	2. Beh. Sci. Seminar II (11 weeks)	2. Decision-Making/ Conflict Mngt Workshop (2 weeks)	
	3. Research Consumption (11 weeks)	3. ELECTIVES (2 weeks)	
	4. Problems Paper II (4 weeks)		
	5. School visits (4 weeks)		
	6. National Convention (1 week)		
	SPRING:		
	1. Behavioral Sci. Seminar III (11 weeks)	1. School Finance & School Law Core (5½ weeks)	1. Visits from University staff during first year back as an administrator (36 weeks)
	2. Problems of Principalship (11 weeks)	2. Decision-Making/ Conflict Mngt Workshop (2 weeks)	
	3. Back-Home Internship (3 weeks)	3. ELECTIVES (2 weeks)	
	4. Problems Paper III (11 weeks)		

July, 1970.

The University of Tennessee
Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program
Directed by Dr. Larry W. Hughes

PROBLEMS PAPERS

The function of the three problems papers is to provide a three phase focus on a practical field problem of some direct relevance to the position which the Fellow will be filling when he returns to his home district. The function of the advisor will be to work with and assist the Fellow as he moves through the three distinct phases.

Problems Paper 1. This paper will be devoted to an analysis of certain community characteristics evident in the home school district from which the Fellow comes. "Community" is defined as that geographic area served by the school system. A suggested outline is provided the Fellow to assist in this community analysis. The purpose of this paper is to provide the Fellow with a broad data base from which to view the functioning of the school system as one of several sub-systems within the community. It is hoped that the inner relationships of the various sub-systems will become evident as the Fellow analyzes and surveys his home community. Certain demographic data, community financial data, geographic setting, socioeconomic make-up of the population, and historical data will be collected and subjected to review and analysis.

An appropriate format is suggested in the accompanying pages. As in all instances of a formal paper, proper form should be followed.

Problems Paper 2. This problems paper is conceived as following logically from the first problems paper, and is an in-depth analysis of data collected about the school system residing within the home community. Thus, where the first problems paper focused on community analysis, the focus here is on school system analysis, more particularly at the level of the school system in which the Fellow likely will be functioning during his first year back in the district. That is, if the Fellow is preparing himself to function

as an elementary principal or similar position he would do an analysis of the elementary schools in the system; if he were to be functioning on a secondary education level he would analyze the High Schools of the system; or if he would likely be operating on a central office level he would view the system from that perspective.

In this problems paper data will be collected with respect to personnel, student population, pertinent school financial data, organizational climate, curriculum, etc. The purpose is to collect data which will assist the Fellow in identifying problems and issues of significance to the effective education of children in the community.

It is conceivable that much effort will be directed towards the construction of a school system profile (at the appropriate level) with respect to the faculty and administration (biographic data, etc.), pupils (socio-economic backgrounds, test results, etc.), etc.

Problems Paper 3. This is the culminating experience. The final problems paper will focus on one school within the district, this school to be the one in which the Fellow will be functioning the following year. It is the purpose of this problems paper to identify a needed change in that particular school, based on relevant data, and proceed to develop a way of implementing this change. The Fellow may draw upon the data which he has collected for problems papers 1 and 2 as well as any other relevant data to help him to define one of the major problems confronting the school. The final problems paper probably will proceed through the following steps:

- 1) Introduction (brief description of community and school system with an indication of the identified pressing educational needs),

2) selection of one or two such needs or problems which the Fellow feels he can attack during the next year.

3) presentation of relevant literature and research about the particular change to be implemented (for example, if the Fellow felt that some sort of a team-teaching arrangement would provide a way of attacking a pressing need, he would present a literature and research review about team-teaching),

4) presentation of the plan of attack or the implementation procedure in narrative form,

5) a graphic illustration of the implementation procedure, i.e. a modified PER (this will be highly specific in nature and will detail in a step-by-step fashion the implementation procedure).